DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 465 685 SO 033 886

AUTHOR Ogawa, Masato; Field, Sherry L.

TITLE Realities of the Introduction of Multiple Historical Perspectives during a Middle School Study on World War II.

PUB DATE 2001-11-15

NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the College and University Faculty Assembly of the National Council for the Social Studies (Washington, DC, November 14-18, 2001).

PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Classroom Research; Classroom Techniques; Grade 6; *Historical Interpretation; Middle Schools; *Perspective Taking; Qualitative Research; Social Studies; *World War II

IDENTIFIERS Constant Comparative Method; Descriptive Research; Georgia

ABSTRACT

This paper reports the results of a sub-study in which middle school students were asked to provide their perspectives and understandings of World War II during a study unit and final project. An investigation was undertaken to determine how students' perspective-taking skills were influenced by the use of a variety of teaching methods regarding the War. Two classes of sixth-grade students in rural Georgia were involved in the study, given the opportunity to compare viewpoints about World War II, and hear multiple perspectives about the events surrounding the War by engaging in a variety of activities, including conducting oral histories. Seven case study students were selected for subsequent interviews. Two oral history narrators, U.S. and Japanese World War II veterans, visited the classroom during the 3-week course. A qualitative case study methodology worked well for the research questions and the descriptive findings. Three principal data sources were used: (1) interviews with the classroom teacher and the seven case study students; (2) classroom observations and participation; and (3) student written assignments. Constant comparison was used as a method of data analysis. Findings suggest that various factors influence student historical perspectives. However, this study did not examine prior student historical knowledge and perspectives based on how knowledge was formed outside of the classroom prior to the course. (Contains 28 references.) (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 465 685

Realities of the Introduction of Multiple Historical Perspectives during a Middle School Study on World War II.

Masato Ogawa
Sherry L. Field

SO 033 886

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Osawa

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Realities of the Introduction of Multiple Historical Perspectives During a Middle School of Study on World War II

Masato Ogawa
Ontario High School
Ontario, OR 97914
mogawa@ontario.K12.or.us

Sherry L. Field
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX 78712
Sherry_field@mail.utexas.edu

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of
The College and University Faculty Assembly, Washington D.C., November 15, 2001

Introduction

This paper reports the results of a sub-study during which middle school students were asked to provide their perspective and understanding of World War II during a unit of study and final project. During the larger study, an investigation was undertaken to determine how students' perspective-taking skills were influenced by the use of a variety of teaching methods about the war. Two classes of sixth grade students in rural Georgia were involved in the study and were given the opportunity to compare viewpoints about World War II and hear multiple perspectives about the events surrounding the war by engaging in a variety of activities, which included conducting oral histories. Research questions in the larger study were: (1) What do middle school students know about World War II prior to a unit of study on World War II? (2) What do middle school students know about World War II after participating in classroom activities? (3) What happens to middle school students' perspective-taking skills as they engage in various activities such as comparative textbook analysis and an oral history activity related to the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki as an addition to the unit of study about World War II? and (4) What perspectives do middle school students share with other middle school students during their end-of-unit presentations?

There are several reasons why a unit of instruction about World War II was selected for the study. However, the most important reason why we selected the topic of World War II for the study was because of our interest in and concern about teaching about World War II in Japan, a home country of one of the authors. In the Japanese educational arena, the treatment of World War II in social studies and history textbooks and teaching and learning about the war have recently been the subjects of much controversy. More recently, Japan has contested with a surge in historical revisionism, characterized by the bestsellers written by right-wing intellectuals, who want to promote "positive" views of Japanese history and society, particularly with respect to World War II. This has caused considerable controversy and criticism from inside and outside Japan, particularly in China and South Korea.

Historical Empathy and Perspective-taking

There is a growing volume of research in Europe and North America bearing on students' ideas about historical understanding, whether characterized as "empathy" or "perspective-taking" (e.g., Ashby & Lee, 1987; Barton, 1996; Dickinson & Lee, 1984; Downey, 1995; Foster, 1999; Foster & Yeager, 1998; Levstik & Barton, 1997; Portal, 1987; Seixas, 1996; Shemilt, 1984; Yeager, Foster, Maley, Anderson, & Morris, 1997, 1998). The term "empathy" often appears in literature on historical thinking. However, the term is often used interchangeably with the term "perspective-taking." For example, the History-Social Studies Framework for the California Public Schools (California State Board of Education, 1997) described "historical empathy" as having "a sense of what it was like to be there," and seeing "through the eyes of people who were there" (pp. 12-13). The National Standards for United States History, Grades 5-12 (National Center for History in the Schools, 1996) included "historical perspective-taking" as a part of "historical comprehension." The Standards defined "historical perspective-taking" as "the ability to describe the past on its own terms, through the eyes and experiences of those who were there" (p. 68).

Downey (1995) distinguished between empathy and perspective-taking and defined perspective-taking in "its most limited, non affective sense" (p.4). There are three main reasons why he used perspective-taking instead of empathy. First, he used the term "perspective-taking" because he attempted "to emphasize the limited scope of the definition" (p. 4). Second, he used the term perspective-taking to describe an activity that is, in Boddington's view (1980), not primarily creative but rational, intellectual, and "concerned with explaining actions, attitudes, and concepts"(p. 18). Finally, he used the term perspective-taking to avoid the problems of confusing empathy and sympathy. In addition, Downey stated, "Constructing attitudes and world views that are quite different from our own is one of the most difficult aspects of historical understanding" (p. 4).

Present studies of historical empathy and perspective-taking have examined how students make sense of the perspectives of people in the past and how students' empathetic understanding increases over a unit of study. They have not emphasized the need to establish a logical hierarchy as did Ashby and Lee (1987), nor have they focused on distinguishing between the two terms. Barton (1996) examined the ability of fourth and fifth grade students to develop perspective-taking skills for people of the past and to avoid the belief that people in the past were no different than today. Interviews with students indicated that they had developed understanding that people in the past had different behaviors and attitudes, and that present perspectives will someday become old-fashioned. Barton pointed to some instructional considerations of historical perspective-taking through analyzing this research. First, students' perspective-taking skills were developed and influenced by teachers' instruction. Second, a variety of activities such as group discussion, compositions, role-plays, simulations, and debates developed students' historical perspective taking skills. Finally, attention to perspective-taking should take place within the context of meaningful, interactive activities in the classroom.

Klages' study (1999) of twelfth grade economics students examined how students constructed historical thinking when they used primary source documents such as oral history interviews, with a focus on the topic of the Great Depression in the United States

in the 1930s. After students learned about the Great Depression, they prepared their own interview guides in order to interview someone who had lived during the period. Klages found that students' oral interviews focused on individuals' personal and family finances. Students discovered significant differences between textual passages about the Great Depression and their oral history interviewees discourses. Most of the interviewees said that their families had not been ruined financially. Klages discovered that students became immersed in the process of history though oral history activities, class and small discussions, and writing narratives. She also found that students considered the Depression era from different perspectives after analyzing primary sources.

Three other studies focused on the development of students' historical empathy on the topic of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. These studies have most informed this study because one part of the studies examined the development of students' historical perspective-taking about this historical event. Yeager, Foster, Maley, Anderson, and Morris (1997, 1998) examined the development of high school students' historical empathy with a focus on the issue of Truman's decision to bomb the atomic bomb on Japan during World War II. Students were divided into two groups. Group One read only one high school textbook while students of Group Two read a variety of primary and secondary sources including a diary written by a Japanese physician, articles from Harry S. Truman's memories, recollections from a prisoner of war, and several excerpts from books and texts. This research found that the students in Group Two were better equipped to view the issue of Truman's decision to bomb Japan in a complex manner and that they found ways to incorporate their own perspectives into their written responses. On the other hand, the members of Group One saw the bomb as an either/or proposition, a simple choice between American and Japanese lives, and they tended to praise Truman for making a tough but necessary decision. The researchers of this study concluded that the teaching of historical thinking can emphasize the necessary awareness for the development of historical empathy. They also concluded that teachers should

encourage students to use various documents, particularly primary documents, for the development of students' historical empathy.

Doppen (2000) used the research model by Yeager and her colleagues (1997, 1998) as a model to analyze the development of fifteen-year-old students' historical empathy though an analysis of eighteen primary source documents related to President Truman's decision to use the atomic bomb against Japan. Prior to the unit of study, students were asked their pre-existing knowledge and perspectives about the atomic bombing. During the unit, students were divided into heterogeneous groups of four. They read high school world history textbooks and a variety of primary and secondary sources presenting several different perspectives, including those of historians, political leaders, and victims. Next, students were required to complete "think aloud" sessions. Each group made oral presentations and prepared a museum display on the use of the atomic bomb. After the unit of the study, students were asked their perspectives about the atomic bombing of Japan. This research found that students developed their multiple perspectives through various activities. Prior to the unit, students lacked a multiple interpretation of Truman's decision to use the atomic bomb, although they had some pre-existing knowledge. Throughout the "think aloud" sessions, students discussed their own perspectives and listened to other perspectives and interpretations. Many students were able to make clear references to multiple perspectives in their essays at the end of the unit. After the unit, most of the students identified diverse perspectives and different interpretations on the event of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Students also reported that they liked the unit of the study and found it interesting; they enjoyed learning about history from different perspectives.

Yeager and Doppen (2001) examined two previous studies about the development of high school students' historical empathy by Yeager and others (1997, 1998) and Doppen (2000). Through analyzing the two studies, they emphasized three points regarding the teaching of historical empathy. First, although it is a time-consuming activity, the teaching of historical empathy is a challenging experience that has the

potential to engage students in worthwhile historical thinking, judgement, and explanation. Second, teachers should help students to reflect on history, to see that history offers understanding, and to broaden their notions of what is historically significant. Finally, Yeager and Doppen found that students learn history better and in greater depth when the teacher acts as a facilitator and they have to "do history."

Foster and Yeager (1999) and Yeager and Foster (2001) also suggested the importance of empathy in the development of historical understanding. They argued that the development of historical empathy is "a considered and active process, embedded in the historical method," which involves four interrelated phases: the introduction of a historical event necessitating the analysis of human action, the understanding of historical context and chronology, the analysis of a variety of historical evidence and interpretations, and the construction of a narrative framework through which historical conclusions are reached. Therefore, the central aim of the teaching and learning of history is "to make sense of the past" (Doppen, 2000). Teachers are clearly key figures for students' development of empathy (Davis, 2001). The teachers' goal should be ensure that students are "in a position to entertain a set of belief and values which are not necessarily his or her own" (Ashby & Lee, 1987, p. 63).

We used the term "perspective-taking" in this study. First, we used "perspective-taking" to avoid the problems of empathy's ambiguities as many researchers pointed out (Ashby & Lee, 1987; Boddington, 1980; Knight, 1989; Portal, 1987; Shemilt, 1980). Second, we employed the term perspective-taking to emphasize its cognitive nature (Barton, 1996; Downey, 1995). Third, we preferred to use historical perspective-taking because as Downey (1995) defined, historical perspective is an ability to differentiate between multiple past perspectives.

Study Participants

The study was conducted during a period of three weeks surrounding Memorial Day in 2000. The site of this study was Greenfield County Middle School (All names of places and people used in this study are pseudonyms), a public middle school located in

Greenfield County in northeast Georgia. The student population of Greenfield County Middle School represents a wide variety of backgrounds, educational levels, and economic conditions. At the time of this study, Greenfield County Middle School had an enrollment of approximately 530 students: 72 % of the students were Euro-Americans, 27% were African-Americans, and 1% were Hispanic. Asian students were not enrolled, and the school did not have a program of English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL).

For this study, one female social studies teacher, Judy Williams, and seven six-grade students with different cultural backgrounds and academic levels were participants. Judy is a white female social studies and mathematics teacher who, at the time of the study, had seven years teaching experience. Judy's social studies classes of 44 sixth grade students reflected the racial makeup of the community and the school. One class (Class I) had 22 students: 11 boys (9 Whites and 2 African-Americans) and 11 girls (5 Whites and 6 African-Americans). The second class (Class II) had 22 students: 13 boys (10 Whites and 3 African-Americans) and 9 girls (7 Whites and 2 African-Americans).

Judy described the students in her two social studies classrooms as including a wide range of academic abilities. She considered Class I to be average or above average academically. She considered Class II to contain a wider range of students, including several who had problems with reading and writing, some special education students, and several students with a high level of both ability and achievement. She thought that the enthusiasm, motivation, and interest of most students were high.

Judy selected seven case study students from these two social studies classes for subsequent interviews by the researcher. Before Judy selected the case study students, one of the authors determined criteria that the case study students should represent sex, diverse cultural backgrounds, and different academic levels. She selected 4 boys (3 Whites and 1 African-American) and 3 girls (2 Whites and 1 African-American). These seven students represented different academic performance levels: 2 high average, 4 average, and 1 low.

Two oral history narrators, an American and a Japanese World War II veteran, visited the classroom during the unit of study. The American veteran, Mr. Martin, was

chosen from the community and volunteered to speak about his experience during World War II and his perspective of the war. Mr. Martin went to the European Theater and he was assigned to a battleship during the war. The Japanese veteran, Mr. Yamada, who can speak English, volunteered to speak about his experience during the war and his perspective of the war. Mr. Yamada was assigned to a tank during the war. His brother was injured due to the dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima. Even though one of the authors invited him to speak, the author had not asked his experience during World War II and his perspective about the war and the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki to avoid placing any influence on the author's perspective and knowledge. The selection of Mr. Yamada was convenient based upon the author's individual relationship with him.

Methodology

We employed a qualitative case study methodology for this study because this design was a good fit for the research questions and the descriptive findings. For this study, we used three principle data sources, allowing for triangulation to enhance validity and reliability: interviews with the classroom teacher and seven case study students, classroom observations and participation, and students' written assignments. One of the authors interviewed each student four times, observed classroom interactions and a teacher's instruction, participated in classroom activities, and wrote regularly in his field notes.

We used constant comparison as a method of data analysis. We wanted to know how different interpretations influenced middle school students' perspectives and how their perspectives were changed, advanced, or were disavowed through various activities. Data analysis included within-case and cross-case analysis. Within-case analysis involved analyzing individual students' data, and cross-case analysis involved comparing and contrasting categories, for each question, across the seven cases.

3-week unit of the instruction about World War II

During the first week of this unit of study, students learned about World War II by listening to Judy's lectures, taking notes on lectures, participating in discussion and

activities, and reading their textbook and handouts. Students learned about the European Theater and then the Pacific Theater. Judy taught that World War II was the "bloodiest and most costly war in history" because millions of troops and civilians were killed or injured between 1939 and 1945. During lectures about the European Theater, she used a map to teach which countries were involved in the war, how Hitler gained political power, and how Germany expanded her territories. She also taught about some important events in the European Theater chronologically, such as Dunkirk, the Battle of Britain, Germany's invasion of the Soviet Union, the Holocaust, and the end of the war in Europe. To teach about the Pacific Theater, she used a concept map about Japan during the war, illustrating ten topics. These ten topics were: Japan's unique characteristics, Japan's expansion, U.S. pressure on Japan, Pearl Harbor, Japan's early success, the Battle of Midway, the U.S. offensive, Roosevelt's call for Japan's surrender, the Manhattan Project and the atomic bombing, and the outcomes of the war. Judy instructed students to copy the concept map while they listened to her lecture. During the lecture, students asked various questions and made personal comments about Japan during the war. Judy proceeded to share new information about the Pacific Theater.

Next, students engaged in a comparative textbook analysis. Judy instructed students to find textual passages of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki from their U.S. textbook (Prentice Hall's *Geography: Tools and Concepts*, 1998) and a translated version from a Japanese textbook (Osaka Shoseki's *Chugaku Shakaika*, 1998). The Prentice Hall text was selected because students used the text in their social studies class and they had used the textbook to learn about World War II as a part of an introductory unit of the geography of North America. The Osaka Shoseki text was selected because it is widely used in Japanese middle schools; it is written for seventh grade students. Students read the textual passages and completed a data sheet originated by Schill (1998) in which students were to classify similar and different treatments of the historical event in these U.S. and Japanese textbooks. Five key topics for comparison were: (1) Creation of the atomic bomb: "Who made the atomic bomb?" "How was the atomic bomb tested?"; (2) America's motives and objectives in using the bomb: "Why did the United States drop the atomic bomb?"; (3) the Soviet role: "What was the Soviet role in the dropping of the atomic bomb?"; (4) Dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima

and Nagasaki: "How do textbooks in the two countries treat the atomic bomb?"; and (5) Aftermath of the bombing: "How many people died or were injured by the atomic bombing?" These five topics were consistent with those from previous studies concerning this historical event by Fleming (1983), Henry (1996), Kazemek (1994), and Siler (1990).

After completing the comparative textbook analysis activity, students learned details about the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Students listened to Judy's lecture and the stories she told about Hiroshima victims. Students also read a one-page handout Judy prepared about Hiroshima's and Nagasaki's destruction due to atomic bombs. She taught about varying perspectives and divergent interpretations. She also taught about the differences between supportable and insupportable claims. She then introduced two stories from the City of Hiroshima web site. She selected a story, "Shigeru's Lunch Box," because the victim of the atomic bombing, Shigeru, was a middle school student. Thus, she thought that her students might be interested in the historical event by learning about someone their own age. She selected another story, "Human Shadow on Stone," because she wanted to teach the scale of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and to teach the term "vaporize." After Judy explained the scale of the atomic bombing by giving detailed information, students learned about a hypothetical situation in which they imagined Hiroshima was their community and a Hiroshima-scale bomb had been dropped. Maps of Georgia and their county, based upon diagrams originated by Hood (1998), were provided for reference and were put in the classroom during the unit. Students discussed informally the realities of the devastation. At the end of the lecture about the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Judy asked students to read a one-page handout about the destruction of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki that she had prepared. Next, she asked students to write a short essay about the historical event.

One of the most important activities during the World War II unit of instruction was the opportunity for students to do oral histories. Students participated in an oral history activity. Judy explained to her students about the oral history activity because her students had never engaged in oral history activities. Judy proceeded by giving a personal example, that of her youngest son's oral history interview project with her 70-

year-old father about his experience during the Korean War. She told her students that this wartime story was inspiration to her because she discovered many things about her father through her son's oral history project. Students listened to the story very quietly and with interest and surprise. Judy decided that the interviews should be done with the whole class so that each student would have equal access to the expert interviews.

Next, students prepared interview questions for the two oral history narrators, Mr. Yamada and Mr. Martin. Judy instructed her students to brainstorm questions they would like to ask to Mr. Yamada and Mr. Martin individually and questions they would like to ask both. Some students prepared interview questions with classmates, while other students, particularly high ability students and students who were interested in history, prepared questions individually. Judy collected the students' interview questions and chose 27 questions for Mr. Yamada and Mr. Martin. Judy typed up these questions for the students to use, making sure to leave enough space under each question for students to make notes during the interviews.

Then, students engaged in a group oral history interview with Mr. Yamada one day and Mr. Martin the following day. During the group interviews, Judy distributed the typed list of questions for each respondent, and then the students took turns asking their questions. While listening to responses of the Japanese and American veterans, students took notes and later discussed their perceptions related to the questions and the veterans' answers. Some students asked additional questions of Mr. Yamada, for instance, about Japanese women's roles during the war and other topics they were interested in such as Japanese martial arts and food. They asked some additional questions of Mr. Martin about the battleship to which he was assigned during the war. Students listened to Mr. Yamada's responses quietly and intently because they wanted to be able to understand Mr. Yamada, whose first language is not English. Some students did not show the same interest in Mr. Martin's story, however.

After the group oral history interview, Judy asked her students to answer questions related to the Japanese and American veterans' stories. To complete the reflective writing assignment, students reviewed their questionnaire sheets and notes. They reflected on their understandings of the multiple perspectives they had gained from their readings, the lectures, and the interviews.

As the unit's culminating activity, students were to prepare and give individual presentations. Judy explained the assignment and how students were to develop their presentations. She informed the students that they would prepare presentations for their classmates about what they had learned during the unit of study about World War II. Judy also explained that students could choose various styles of presentations, such as drawings, oral reports, and paper presentations and that they should use diverse materials such as photographs, maps, books, web sites, and other primary and secondary sources. While preparing their presentations, Judy asked students to recall what they had learned during the unit of study about World War II. She also asked them to discuss topics or events related to World War II or to identify those that they found interesting. Some students mentioned specific historical events that occurred during the war, such as Pearl Harbor, the Holocaust, and the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, while other students mentioned specific historical figures such as Hitler, Einstein, and Yamamoto. A few students revealed that they were interested in the weapons used during the war.

Findings

Case One: Jon

Jon was a student in Judy's first social studies class. Judy described Jon as an average student in terms of ability but had an incredible desire to learn about history. When Judy explained this study, he expressed his strong interest in learning about World War II and revealed that his grandfather was involved in the war. In fact, he watched the History Channel, and Judy described that he had brought in several books during the year pertaining to subjects his class was studying.

Jon was the only student who did not clearly show multiple perspectives about World War II and the atomic bombing during the instruction of the unit about World War II. Before the unit of the instruction about World War II, he referred to the History Channel as his main information about World War II and revealed his richer knowledge about Pearl Harbor and Midway. However, he focused only on factual information. After classroom instruction, he was the only student who did not indicate Judy as one of

his information sources about the war. In fact, he shared additional facts about D-Day and Iwo Jima that Judy had not covered during her lecture. Asked about his perspective about the atomic bombing, Jon indicated that he accepted the U.S. standard perspective of the bombing. He gave the well-known traditionalist view: the United States pushed Japan to surrender and Japan refused to surrender. After the comparative textbook analysis activity and classroom instruction about the atomic bombing, Jon continued to believe that the using the bomb was the right decision, and his perspective was the same as it was after Judy's instruction about World War II. After the oral history activity, however, he did not indicate his perspective about the atomic bombing, probably because he was struggling to reconcile his existing knowledge with the new information gained through the oral history activity.

Jon chose the topic of D-Day for his final presentation. He drew a battle scene from the Normandy coast, but his picture was non-emotional. He drew a German coast-defense gun on the right side and a boat sailing to the coast and infantrymen wading ashore on the bottom of the right. Some infantrymen were pinned down by German fire, some were thrown out from boats, and some were drowning in the rising tide. Jon also drew three U.S. bombers on the top of the picture. However, he confused British Royal Air Force bombers and U.S. Air Force bombers. Jon's picture was interesting to us because it was very similar to the opening of the movie, *Saving Private Ryan*. Jon, unlike the other six students, drew the picture without using any reference materials about the topic. Because he had previously mentioned that the movie and the History Channel were his information sources about World War II, his knowledge and perspective about World War II appeared to the most influenced by the media.

Case Two: Ben

Ben was a student in Judy's first social studies class. Judy described Ben as a high ability student and that he was an outstanding reader and writer. He participated in class and had an eager attitude towards learning. He enjoyed social studies and

understood most of what he had learned. His answers to Judy's questions were always accurate. However, he sometimes chatted with his classmates, especially Jon.

Before the instruction of the unit about World War II, Ben, like Jon, referred to the History Channel as his main information about World War II. He understood that Germany's invasion of Poland caused France and Great Britain to declare war on Germany. It is interesting to note that his description about the war was very similar to Jon's description. After classroom instruction about World War II, Ben particularly increased his knowledge about the war. He identified the temporal structure of the causes of World War II in both European and Pacific Theaters and established the chronological order. Asked about his perspective about the atomic bombing, like Jon, Ben indicated that he accepted the U.S. traditional view about the use of the atomic bomb. After the comparative textbook analysis activity and classroom instruction about the atomic bombing, Ben showed somewhat multiple perspectives. While Ben supported the use of the atomic bomb, he criticized its use because it destroyed cities and killed innocent civilians. After the oral history activity, however, Ben did not clearly indicate his perspective about the atomic bombing, probably because he was struggling to reconcile his existing knowledge with the new information gained through the oral history activity.

Ben had indicated that he was most interested in the topics of Jews in the concentration camps and the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. However, he chose the topic of kamikaze pilots for his presentation. He had never mentioned kamikaze pilots in his interviews. However, when Judy explained that Japanese pilots, known as kamikazes, volunteered for suicide mission, he made a personal comment saying that the kamikaze pilots were "crazy." Ben could not understand why these young Japanese pilots were willing to take their own lives for their country. During her lecture, Judy reiterated to students the Western perspective that Japanese people honored samurai and that samurai believed it was an honor to die in battle. Ben chose the topic for his presentation because he wanted to know more about kamikaze pilots. He drew a picture about a kamikaze pilot diving to bomb a battleship or a carrier. He explained his picture;

Ben: Kamikaze pilots were treated with great ceremony. There were plenty of kamikaze pilots to spare. They were put to work immediately when they became kamikaze pilots. On October 25, five zeros carried bombs and located a carrier group and began to attack. All five kamikaze were successful in hitting carriers. Before a mission, the kamikaze pilots went through an ancient ceremony based on the rites of the ancient samurai. After receiving final libation, the pilot was helped by a comrade to put the samurai headband on symbolizing courage and composure.

Case Three: Cindy

Cindy was a student in Judy's first social studies class. Judy described Cindy as a high or average student who was extremely shy and quiet. The author never observed that she participated actively in class discussions or asked questions in class.

Cindy's knowledge prior to the instruction about World War II was vague. She characterized the war as "sad" and the atomic bombing as "very deadly." However, she did not provide sufficient reasons why she thought that way. After classroom instruction, Cindy expanded her knowledge about World War II. She revealed that she understood the atomic bombing better after Judy's lecture. Cindy indicated that Albert Einstein and many scientists were involved in the secret plan of the development of the atomic bomb. However, at the point, she did not show her perspective about the historical event. After the comparative textbook analysis activity and classroom instruction about the atomic bombing, Cindy suggested the possibility of multiple perspectives. Cindy indicated that she believed the United States should have dropped only one atomic bomb on Japan. She grappled with the information signifying the human and economic costs of the war. In spite of limited understanding of the event, she attempted to understand multiple perspectives and build her own perspective. After the oral history activity, Cindy described the atomic bombing as "very dangerous." Cindy identified positively with Mr. Martin's perspective because the atomic bombing saved both American and Japanese lives.

Cindy chose the topic of the Holocaust for her final presentation, although she had previously indicated that she was interested in the atomic bombing. However, she could

not articulate any concrete reasons about why she changed. Using the library books, she drew a picture of one Jewish boy wearing a white cap and a red and green shirt. The boy was placed in the center of the picture with barbed wire fences behind him. Cindy emphasized the boy's unnaturally short hair. She drew a number, "3-3692," on his left arm. On the upper left side, Cindy drew one B-29 bomber dropping a bomb. She explained her drawing,

> Cindy: Nazi[s] hated Jews because they were different and the Germans were losing the war and blamed it on Jews. Nazi[s] had Jews cut hair because of [the] thought of lice. Many Jews were killed.

Cindy's compassion about the dropping of the atomic bomb was also apparent in her picture. It is stark, lonely, and desolate, yet the boy is a large figure. However, Cindy drew the boy who appeared to be brave in the face of a desperate situation.

Case Four: Steve

Steve was a student in Judy's second social studies class. Judy described Steve as having low academic ability. He worked as hard as any other student in the class and he positively participated in class and was very proud of himself when he correctly remembered an answer. When he answered Judy's questions correctly and she responded "Good" or "Great," he smiled with pride. Judy shared that he learned best when taught orally, through lecture-class and discussion, rather than through reading material.

Steve's prior knowledge about World War II contained some misinformation and misunderstanding. Steve believed that the United States fought against the Soviet Union during the war. He probably misunderstood two different time periods: World War II and the Cold War. Steve did not know anything about the atomic bombing, and he seemed not to understand even the meaning of the term "atomic bombing." After Judy's instruction about World War II, Steve increased his knowledge about World War II and revealed details about Hitler, even though his knowledge about World War II and Hitler included misinformation and misunderstanding. His data clearly indicated that his knowledge about the war was strongly influenced by Judy's instruction. For example,

Steve remembered the metaphor, "Japan woke a sleeping giant," that Judy had used to teach about Pearl Harbor. However, Steve did not seem to clearly understand the war even after hearing her lecture. After the comparative textbook analysis activity and classroom instruction about the atomic bombing. Steve suggested the possibility of multiple perspectives. . Steve did not support the use of the atomic bomb because the atomic bombing was "morally wrong." However, he challenged his own perspective.

> Steve: It was morally wrong because thousands of civilians got killed for nothing. It was a choice though, it was like send a man to battle and get thousands of Americans killed, either that, or just drop a bomb.

After engaging in the oral history activity, Steve characterized the atomic bombing as "horrible" because the bombing caused many deaths. Steve identified positively with Mr. Yamada's perspective because he accepted his perspective that the United States wanted to show its strength to the Soviet Union.

Steve chose Hitler for his final presentation. He drew two different faces of Hitler: his interpretation of a "good" Hitler and "bad" Hitler. Because Steve knew that Hitler was an artist, he drew "good" Hitler as a painter who purely loved arts. He drew "good" Hitler with a red beret, a pallet, and a brush. Steve drew "bad" Hitler as a powerful dictator shown in many pictures. His drawing of "bad" Hitler looked ugly compared to "good" Hitler. Steve drew a fire behind Hitler as a symbol that Hitler was always involved in war. The fire could also be symbolic of the devil. His two pictures represent his interest in the contradiction of Hitler's personal life, particularly how the person who loved arts became a dictator who caused World War II. The two veterans' different statements about Hitler probably also influenced his picture.

Case Five: Sherry

A student in Judy's second social studies class, Sherry sat on the front row in the classroom. Judy described Sherry as a high ability student who was capable of learning in any style. She asked many questions and made personal comments during Judy's lecture. Sherry enjoyed class discussions and note-taking more than reading the text.

She also enjoyed drawing pictures. Her picture was displayed on the bulletin board of her art class.

Prior to the unit of instruction about World War II, Sherry characterized the war as "very deadly." Asked about the atomic bombing, Sherry confused different key historical events, such as Pearl Harbor, and the Battle of Midway, and the atomic bombing. After Judy's instruction about World War II, Sherry expanded her knowledge about the war. Sherry's data clearly indicated that her knowledge about the war was influenced by Judy's lecture. Sherry described the war as " a bloody war" because she recalled Judy's explanation that World War was the "bloodiest and most costly war in history." Although Sherry did not seem to know about the atomic bombing after Judy's instruction about World War II, she showed somewhat multiple perspectives after the comparative textbook analysis activity and classroom instruction about the atomic bombing. Sherry questioned why the United States used the atomic bomb, but she understood that the use of the atomic bomb ended World War II. Asked about her perspective about the atomic bombing after the oral history activity, Sherry did not identify positively with either Mr. Martin's or Mr. Yamada's perspective and shared a sense of balance.

Sherry chose the topic of the Holocaust for her final presentation. She traced the photographs about the Holocaust that Judy had used in the class. She drew three persons: a woman, a child, and a soldier. The woman might be identified as the child's mother, who wore a green coat and carried two bags. The child can be identified as Jewish because a yellow badge was drawn on his or her clothing. The woman and her child were holding up their hands because the soldier with a gun, possibly a member of the Gestapo, was trying to arrest them. Sherry drew the Nazi swastika and the yellow star on the building behind them. Her picture illustrates that she understood that the Nazis arrested Jews and vandalized Jewish businesses. Sherry did not draw the feet of the woman and her child. She probably wanted to express that they could not escape from Nazi influences because they were Jewish.

Case Six: Tom

Tom, a student in Judy's second social studies class, always sat next to Sherry. Judy described Tom as an average student in terms of academic ability, but an above average student in terms of enthusiasm and attitude. Like Jon, Tom was interested in learning about World War II. He participated actively in class discussion, and enjoyed group activities.

Tom's knowledge about World War II prior to the unit of instruction about the war was vague. His response about the persecution of Jews showed his misunderstanding and biased perspective due to his limited knowledge about the Holocaust. Asked about the atomic bombing, Tom did not know anything about the historical event, and he seemed not to understand even the meaning of the term "atomic bombing." After Judy's instruction about World War II, Tom expanded his knowledge about World War II. However, he mainly focused on topics related to the Pacific Theater, and he did not indicate much about the European Theater. He did not connect new information with prior knowledge about the war. After the comparative textbook analysis activity and Judy's instruction about the atomic bombing, Tom indicated his perspective. He argued against the use of the atomic bombing because he believed that it killed many innocent people and that many people are still suffering from its radiation today. After engaging in the oral history activity, Tom indicated a very interesting interpretation of the atomic bombing. He reasoned that the United States had dropped the atomic bombs partially because of their understanding about Japanese, "samurai spirit." He remembered that Judy had taught that samurai were honored to die in battle rather than to surrender.

Tom chose two topics for his presentation: the USS Indianapolis and the previously mentioned atomic bomb. He differed from other classmates who chose only one topic. He drew the atomic bomb on the left side and the USS Indianapolis on the right side. The two pictures seemed to represent his perspective that World War II caused many tragedies in both the United States and Japan. He drew two scenes related

to the atomic bomb: the black atomic blast and the mushroom cloud. Tom explained his picture about the atomic bomb;

> Tom: The atomic bomb was one of the most powerful bombs ever made. When the *Enola Gay* dropped the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, it killed hundreds of thousands people. We can only estimate how people were killed by the blast because whole families were killed, buildings were destroyed, and many were vaporized. The blast was a fatal destination.

Tom drew two pictures about the USS Indianapolis: before and after the battle ship sank. The secrecy of its mission intrigued Tom because he wrote that "No one knew it [the Indianapolis] was missing for three years" and that "it was such a secret mission." However, he confused a German submarine and a Japanese submarine. Tom's pictures about the USS Indianapolis indicated that his presentation was somewhat influenced by the media. Tom's two pictures about the USS Indianapolis looked like a luxury passenger ship, and his picture illustrating the sinking ship was very similar to one scene of the movie, *Titanic*. Although the authors did not ask him if he had watched the movie, he might have seen the famous scene before.

> Tom: The USS Indianapolis was coming back from an island called "Titian" and had just dropped off cargo there. It was coming back when a German submarine shot a torpedo at the bottom of the ship. Since the ship had a lot of explosives and ammunition on it, it made a huge explosion killing many. The ship sunk in 18 minutes. Eight hundred people survived the sinking. But, since the ship sunk in shark infested waters, five hundred people were eaten.

<u>Case Seven: Mary</u>

Mary was a student in Judy's second social studies class. Judy described Mary as an average level student in terms of academic ability, and who was an enthusiastic learner with a sunny disposition every day. We observed that Mary seemed to occasionally lose interest in learning. She sometimes looked outside and chatted with her classmates, while other classmates took notes on lectures or participated in class discussion.

Mary's knowledge prior to the unit of instruction about World War II was vague. She indicated her confusion about how both Jews and the Nazis could be from Germany. Asked about the atomic bombing, Mary did not know anything about the historical event, and she seemed not to understand even the meaning of the term "atomic bombing." After Judy's instruction about World War II, Mary expanded her knowledge about World War II. However, she mainly focused on topics related to the Pacific Theater that she most recently gained information from Judy. After the comparative textbook analysis activity and Judy's instruction about the atomic bombing, Mary argued against the use of the atomic bomb because she believed that it killed many innocent people and that it was " a waste of our technology." After engaged in the oral history activity, asked about her perspective about the atomic bombing, Mary embraced both veterans' perspectives about the historical event. She did not articulate any concrete reasons, however, about why she thought that way.

Mary chose the topic of the atomic bombing for her final presentation. She drew Little Boy on the top. She was possibly impressed by the contrast between the name of the bomb and the scale of the bomb. Mary drew two pictures related to the atomic bomb: the mushroom cloud over Nagasaki and the U.S. B-29 bomber, *Enola Gay*. Her pictures represent her perspective that the dropping of the atomic bombs caused many fatalities in Japan. Mary explained her pictures and the scale of the atomic bomb;

> Mary: The atomic bomb gave a huge explosion on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The plane from where it came from was *Enola Gay*. We still don't know how many people died from the atomic bomb. Radiation from the atomic bomb killed or injured thousands of Japanese. The people that didn't die from the explosion suffered from radiation sickness. They vomited uncontrollably, spit up blood, and died in agony. If you looked directly in the fireball, you would go blind. People that were standing near pavement left their shadows. The heat killed them, the radiation turned the pavement white, so the pavement was black from their shadows. The pilot of *Enola Gay* didn't realize what he was dropping the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Few years later, he found out what it was and the he killed himself.

Mary's end-of-unit presentation provided rich explanations about the aftermath of the atomic bombing. She concisely described the powerful scale of the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. However, she continued to include misinformation that the U.S. pilot committed suicide. She had not known enough about the incident to call this inaccuracy into question during the class. In fact, like other classmates, Mary had listened to the story very quietly and with interest.

Conclusion

The end-of-unit presentations provided an opportunity for students to express their opinions about World War II and to showcase what they had learned. Students were given freedom in regard to what and how to present their information. During their presentations, students could talk about their own projects and compare them with those of other classmates. Although their projects were unique, most of the students did not elaborate about them. Some students just read their brief comments that they had written for their projects. Some students stated only the basics: "I drew a picture about the Holocaust" or " I drew the atomic bomb because I am interested in the topic." They did not mention why they chose the topics, how they prepared, what resources they used, or what they learned though their projects. Additionally, students did not ask questions or make comments about other students' projects. According to Judy, her students did not have much prior experience with giving such presentations. Judy stated that she would have used other strategies if students had more knowledge, but because so much of the content was new to them, she concentrated on building initial understandings.

Students' final presentations included a few examples that represented multiple perspectives, even though they were not asked specifically to do so. For example, Tom showed somewhat multiple perspectives. Tom, who was the only student who chose two topics for his presentation, drew the atomic bomb and the USS Indianapolis. His two pictures seemed to represent his perspective that World War II caused many tragedies in both victorious countries, such as the United States, and the defeated countries, such as

Japan. On the other hand, Jon's non-emotional picture illustrating a battle scene from the Normandy coast, while full of details, was fairly uni-dimensional.

This study showed that various factors influence students' historical perspective-taking. However, this study was not able to provide a complete picture of students' historical perspective-taking or how it developed within multiple contexts. Indeed, this study did not examine how students' historical knowledge and perspective-taking were influenced outside of classrooms or how their knowledge and perspective-taking were formed prior to the unit of study. Further research on students' interactions with their families and friends, their use of media such as television, movies, magazines, and books, and their contact with historical information at times outside of school remains necessary.

REFERENCES

Ashby, R., & Lee, P. (1987). Children's concepts of empathy and understanding in history. In C. Portal (Ed.), The history curriculum for teachers (pp. 62-88). Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.

Barton, K. C. (1994). Historical understanding among elementary children (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1994).

Barton, K. C. (1996). Did the devil just run out of juice? Historical perspective-taking among elementary students. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Boddington, T. (1980). Empathy and the teaching of history. British Journal of Educational Studies, 28 (1), 13-19.

Brophy, J., & VanSledright, B. (1997). Teaching and learning history in elementary schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

California State Board of Education (1987). History-Social science framework. Sacramento, CA: California State Board of Education.

Dickinson, A. K., & Lee, P. J. (1984). Making sense of history. In A. K. Dickinson, P. J. Lee, & P. J. Rogers (Eds.), Learning history (pp. 117-153). London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Doppen, F. H. (2000). Teaching and learning multiple perspectives: The atomic bomb. The Social Studies, 91 (4), 159-169.

Downey, M. T. (1995). Perspective taking and historical thinking: Doing history in a fifth-grade classroom. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Foster, S. J. (1999). Using historical empathy to excite studies about the study of history: Can you empathize with Neville Chamberlain? The Social Studies, 90 (1), 18-24.

Foster, S. J., & Yeager, E. A. (1998). The role of empathy in the development of historical understanding. International Journal of Social Education, 13 (1), 1-7.

Henry, S. M. (1996). Where do we stand on the A-bomb? OAH Magazine of History, 10 (3), 51-2.

Hood, E. (1998). How powerful is a nuclear bomb? In S. L. Field (Ed.), Tora no Maki III (pp. 119-128). Washington D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.

Kazemek, F. E. (1994). "Two Handful of Bones and Ash": Teaching Our Children about Hiroshima. Phi Delta Kappan, 75 (7), 531-534.

Klages, C. L. (1999). Secondary social studies students' engagement with historical thinking and historical empathy as they use oral history interviews. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1999).

Knight, P. (1980). Empathy: Concept, confusion, and consequences in a national curriculum. Oxford Review of Education, 15 (1), 41-53.

Levstik, L. S., & Barton, K.C. (1997). Doing history: Investigating with children in elementary and middle schools. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

National History Standards Project. (1994). National standards for United States history:Exploring the American experience. Los Angeles: National Center for History in the Schools.

Portal, C. (1987). Empathy as an objective for history teaching. In C. Portal (Ed.), The history curriculum for teachers (pp. 89-99). Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.

Schill, K. (1998). Multiple perspectives on Hiroshima. Social Studies & the Young Learner, 10 (3). P5-P6.

Seixas, P. (1996). Conceptualizing the growth of historical understanding. In D. Olson & N. Torrance (Eds.), The handbook of education and human development: New models of learning, teaching and schooling (pp. 765-783). Oxford: Blackwell.

Shemilt, D. (1980). Schools council history 13-16 project: Evaluation study. Edinburgh: Holmes McDougall.

Shemilt, D. (1984). Beauty and the philosopher: Empathy in history and classroom. In A. K. Dickinson, P. J. Lee, & P. J. Rogers (Eds.), Learning history (pp. 39-84). London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Siler, C. R. (1990). United States textbooks: Cloned mediocrity. International Journal of Social Studies, 4 (3), 10-31.

Yeager, E. A., and Doppen, F. (2001). Teaching and learning multiple perspectives on the use of the atomic bomb: Historical empathy in the secondary classroom. In O.L. Davis, Jr., E. Yeager, & S. Foster (Eds.), Historical empathy and perspective taking in the social studies (pp. 21-50). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Yeager, E. A., & Foster, S. J. (2001). The role of empathy in the development of historical understanding. In O.L. Davis Jr., E. Yeager,& S. Foster (Eds.), Historical empathy and perspective taking in the social studies (pp. 13-19). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Yeager, E. A., Foster, S. J., Maley, S. D., Anderson, T., & Morris III, J. W. (1997). Harry Truman and the atomic bomb: A high school classroom study in historical empathy. The Iowa Council for the Social Studies Journal, 10 (1), 53-61.

Yeager, E. A., Foster, S. J., Maley, S. D., Anderson, T., & Morris III, J. W. (1998). Why people in the past acted as they did: An exploratory study in historical empathy. International Journal of Social Education, 13 (1), 8-24.